



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,136	09/28/2001	Sanjai Narain	1458-US	4446
9941	7590	12/06/2004	EXAMINER	
TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC. ONE TELCORDIA DRIVE 5G116 PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-4157			VU, THONG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,136

Applicant(s)

NARAIN, SANJAI

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/23/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1-9 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1,3,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. Evidence of concealment of the best mode is based upon (i.e.: a set of intermediate abstractions, a decomposition of the end-end service requirement).
3. Claims 1,3,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. (i.e.: a set of intermediate abstractions, a decomposition of the end-end service requirement).
4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. Evidence of concealment of the best mode is based upon (i.e.: the vendor neutral requirement).
5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention (i.e.: the vendor neutral requirement).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-2,8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dynarski et al [Dynarski 6,466,571 B1].

7. As per claim 1, Dynarski discloses a system for configuring networks, the network configuration being based on an end-to-end service requirements [Dynarski, configuration and statistics database, col 14 lines 12-41; end to end transit, col 15 lines 15], said system comprising:

database for storing a set of configuration parameters, each configuration parameter relating to a setting on a device in the network [Dynarski, configuration and statistics database, col 14 lines 12-37];

a database having a set of intermediate abstractions, each of said intermediate abstractions representing a decomposition of the end-to-end service requirement [Dynarski, configuration and statistics database, col 14 lines 12-41; end to end transit, col 15 lines 15]; and

a processor (i.e.: Mobile call Processor, MCP) coupled to said configuration database and said intermediate abstractions database, said processor executing the

Art Unit: 2142

method step of compiling the set of intermediate abstractions into configurations parameters [Dynarski, MCP configuration parameters, col 14 lines 38-50].

8. As per claim 2, Dynarski discloses checking said compiled parameters against said library requirements to determine if there inconsistency between said compiled parameters; and sending said compiled parameters to said configuration parameters database if said checking results in no inconsistencies [Dynarski, the servers detect the information or parameters and enter into table mapping, col 7 lines 44-60, col 8 lines 37-52].

9. Claim 8 contains the similar limitations set forth of claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

10. As per claim 9, Dynarski discloses checking said compiled parameters against said library requirements to determine if there inconsistency between said compiled parameters; and sending said compiled parameters to said configuration parameters database if said checking results in no inconsistencies [Dynarski, the servers detect the information or parameters and enter into table mapping, col 7 lines 44-60, col 8 lines 37-52].

11. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Dynarski et al [Dynarski 6,466,571 B1].

12. As per claim 3, Dynarski discloses a system for diagnosing configuration errors in a network, the network being based on a set of end-to-end service requirements, said system comprising:

a database for storing a set of configuration parameters, each configuration parameter relating to a setting on a device in the network; a database having a set of intermediate abstractions, each of said intermediate abstractions representing a decomposition of the end-to-end service requirement; and processor, coupled to said configuration parameters database and to said intermediate abstractions database, for recursively determining the consistency between the configuration parameters and the intermediate abstractions [Dynarski, MCP configuration parameters include a set of configuration parameters, col 14 lines 12-50];

means coupled to said processor for creating a record of each inconsistency found [Dynarski, Dynamic call database, col 12 lines 28-52; col 13 line 45-col 14 line 12].

13. As per claim 4, Dynarski discloses said intermediate abstractions are expressed as Boolean functions of the configuration parameters as inherent feature of CRC calculation [Dynarski, calculation, col 13 lines 45-55].

14. As per claim 5, Dynarski discloses said configuration parameter database comprises a LDAP directory having configuration information about all the devices in the network as inherent feature of a configuration database.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Dynarski et al [Dynarski 6,466,571 B1] in view of Goldman et al [Goldman, 6,374,352 B1].

16. As per claim 6, Dynarski discloses a method for detecting network configurations errors based on a set of vendor neutral requirements that govern performance in the network [Dynarski, the home agent detects the mobile binding record, col 6 line 57-col 7 line 10], said method comprising the steps of:

creating a set of configuration parameters, each configuration parameter relating to a setting on a device in the network [Dynarski, configuration and statistics database, col 14 lines 12-37];

However Dynarski does not detail recursively determining if said at least one vendor neutral requirement is true (i.e.: testing) based on said created set of configuration parameters; and creating a record of said at least one translated end-to-

Art Unit: 2142

end service requirements that were determined to be false, said record representing the diagnosis.

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the configuration process on SNMP/ATM network and found Goldman teaching. Goldman discloses a temporary configuration with fallback feature wherein the software stored configuration in record and detect the test configuration data, determine whether the test data is to be used [Goldman, abstract; SNMP/ATM and the configuration database, col 3 line 53-col 4 line 51 et seq; storing an escape record, col 1 lines 30-57 et seq]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the detecting of test data to determine the value of record as taught by Goldman into the Dynarski's apparatus in order to utilize the configuration database. Doing so would provide a simple, quick, and efficient process to configure the parameters for the network devices.

17. As per claim 7, Dynarski-Goldman disclose the vendor neutral requirements are created by decomposing end-to-end service requirements [Dynarski, end to end transite, col 15 lines 15].

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00AM- 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Jack Harvey*, can be reached at (571) 272-3896.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Application/Control Number: 09/966,136

Page 8

Art Unit: 2142

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

After Final (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thong', with a horizontal line underneath.